



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/686,719	10/17/2003	Jong-Phil Lee	44663	8798
7590	05/16/2007	EXAMINER		
Peter L. Kendall Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. Suite 600 1300 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036			LAI, MICHAEL C	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2109				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/16/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/686,719	LEE, JONG-PHIL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael C. Lai	2143

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 October 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 October 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file. This application has foreign priority of 10/21/2002 claimed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claim 1-2 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salo et al (US 6,563,800 B1, hereinafter Salo).

5. Regarding claim 1, Salo discloses data information management devices that have a web server application and communication capabilities allowing them to interface with wireless communication networks. The devices also have graphical

displays to accommodate their browsing capabilities. The devices may use different markup languages to interpret, format, and display the contents of the retrieved information. The devices are wireless and include devices that are well-known in the art, such as hand-held wireless phones, Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs), MICROSOFT.RTM. Windows CE devices, and mobile computers. (column 6 line 64 – column 7 line 25). Salo also discloses a memory module on the device to store data of the information management menus (column 15 lines 47-55).

Salo discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, however, Salo failed to specifically recite the homepage of the devices and that the web server is an embedded web server. Nonetheless these features are not patentably distinct. The goal of Salo's device is to have substantial PDA capabilities plus substantial wireless communication capabilities. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to specify these two features at the time of the invention.

6. Regarding claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further Salo discloses managing subscriber information (e.g., messaging and collaboration information, such as electronic mail, appointment calendars, address/phone books) (column 6 lines 33-53).

7. Claims 3-14 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salo in view of Shi et al (US 7,032,003 B1, hereinafter Shi).

8. Regarding claim 3, Salo discloses: providing for mobile telephones that implement a web server application and communication capabilities allowing them to

interface with wireless communication networks. The devices also implement graphical displays to accommodate their browsing capabilities. The devices may use different markup languages to interpret, format, and display the contents of the retrieved information. The devices are wireless and include devices that are well-known in the art, such as hand-held wireless phones, Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs), MICROSOFT.RTM. Windows CE devices, and mobile computers. (column 6 line 64 – column 7 line 25). Salo also discloses a memory module on the device to store data of the information management menus (column 15 lines 47-55).

Salo discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, but fails to disclose the data synchronization method between the mobile telephone and the web browser. However Shi discloses a method to synchronize a local data storage on a mobile phone with a web browser (claims 1-13). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Shi into the system of Salo at the time of the invention. The modification would have been obvious because having data on mobile phones synchronized with the web browser is logical.

9. Regarding claim 4, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further Salo discloses wherein the data processing device further executes a display redirect application that provides for redirecting display of accessed devices from the mobile telephone display to a display associated with the remote network device (column 6 lines 33-53).

10. Regarding claim 5, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further Shi discloses a method to synchronize local data storage on a mobile phone with a web browser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Shi into the method of Salo at the time of the invention.

11. Regarding claim 6, the rejection of claim 4 is incorporated, and further Salo discloses standard protocols for communication between the mobile telephone and a communication system using the web browser (claims 2, 7).

12. Regarding claim 7, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and further Salo discloses standard protocols for communication between the mobile telephone and a communication system using the web browser (claims 2, 7).

13. Regarding claim 8, the rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further Salo discloses managing subscriber information (e.g., messaging and collaboration information, such as electronic mail, appointment calendars, address/phone books) (column 6 lines 33-53).

14. Regarding claim 9, Salo discloses executable instructions for mobile telephones that implement a web server application and communication capabilities allowing them to interface with wireless communication networks. The devices also have instructions providing graphical displays to accommodate their browsing capabilities. The devices may use different markup languages to interpret, format, and display the contents of the retrieved information. The devices are wireless and include devices that are well-known in the art, such as hand-held wireless phones, Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs),

MICROSOFT.RTM. Windows CE devices, and mobile computers. (column 6 line 64 – column 7 line 25).

Salo discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, but fails to disclose the data synchronization instructions between the mobile telephone and the web browser. However, Shi discloses instructions to synchronize local data storage on a mobile phone with a web browser. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teaching of Shi into the system of Salo at the time of the invention. The modification would have been obvious because having data on mobile phones synchronized with the web browser is logical.

15. Regarding claim 10, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Shi discloses: wherein managing the mobile telephone further includes the step of displaying at the remote network device the identical display of information provided to the mobile telephone.

16. Regarding claim 11, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Shi discloses programs to synchronize local data storage on a mobile phone with a web browser (claims 15-18).

17. Regarding claim 12, the rejection of claim 10 is incorporated, and further Salo discloses standard protocols for communication between the mobile telephone and a communication system using the web browser (claims 2, 7).

18. Regarding claim 13, the rejection of claim 11 is incorporated, and further Salo discloses standard protocols for communication between the mobile telephone and a communication system using the web browser (claims 2, 7).

Art Unit: 2143

19. Regarding claim 14, the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and further Salo discloses managing subscriber information (e.g., messaging and collaboration information, such as electronic mail, appointment calendars, address/phone books) (column 6 lines 33-53).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Lai whose telephone number is (571) 270-3236. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marvin Lateef can be reached on (571) 272-5026. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael C. Lai
08MAY2007


MARVIN M. LATEEF
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER